

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 remain pending. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 7, and 9 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to applicability of Doctrine of Equivalents.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowance of the independent claims if rewritten to include some features associated with "a WILD update message," as described on pages 21-22 of applicants' provisional application, 60/200,401.

With respect to the issue of the full name of each inventor, applicants submit herewith a supplemental Declaration with the full name of each inventor.

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 with respect to U.S. Patent No. 7,725,596, which issued from U.S. Patent Application No. 09/844759.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704 to McCanne et al. ("McCanne") in view of "Host Anycasting Service" to Partridge et al. ("Partridge") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,820,133 to Grove et al. ("Grove") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,731 to Kavak et al. ("Kavak").

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

A method, comprising:
receiving, at an information object repository, a request from a client for an information object at an address identified by a uniform resource locator (URL);
mapping the URL to a corresponding anycast address for the information object, wherein the information object repository is selected according to specified performance metrics by mapping an address of the client to one or more addresses of information object repositories and to one or more addresses of routers that have a best type-of-service distance to the address of the client, wherein the mapping the address of the client to the one or more addresses of information object repositories and to the one or more addresses of routers is performed by executing a Web Information Locator by Distance

(WILD) communication protocol between the routers that store one or more first type-of-service distances from one or more information object repositories to the address of the client and one or more second type-of-service distances from one or more routers to the address of the client, wherein the routers communicate to each other WILD update messages to update mapping of client address ranges to the addresses of Web caches and redirecting routers, wherein a WILD update message includes a basic routing table, a list of type-of-service distances from the Web caches to destinations; and a list of type-of-service distances from the redirecting routers to the destinations, wherein the WILD communication protocol runs on top of a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP);
determining whether the anycast address can be resolved into a real unicast address that is uniquely identified for the information object in the Internet; resolving the anycast address for the information object to the unicast address for the information object, if the corresponding anycast address can be resolved into the unicast address, wherein resolving the anycast address comprises sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP);
returning a failure if the anycast address cannot be resolved into the unicast address; and
obtaining a copy of the information object using the resolved unicast address.

(Amended claim 1)(emphasis added).

The Examiner indicated that “a WILD update messages that is used for communicating the mapping of client address ranges to neighboring routers, where the WILD update message contains three components: (1) a basic routing table, (2) a list of TOS distances from the web caches to destinations; and (3) a list of TOS distances from redirecting routers to destinations... would likely distinguish the claims over the prior art.” The Examiner suggested that “if this feature was incorporated into the independent claims..., the claims would be in condition for allowance.” (Office Action, pages 3-4).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 in light of the Examiner’s suggestion.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is now allowable.

Given that independent amended claims 7 and 9 contain limitations that are similar to those limitations set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 7 and 9 are now allowable.

Given that claims 3-6, 8, 11, and 13 depend from amended independent claims 1, 7, and 9, and add additional limitations, applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-6, 8, 11, and 13 are now allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If Examiner believes that a telephone conference would assist in the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned at (408) 720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 7, 2010

/Tatiana Rossin/
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No.: 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300

Customer No. 008791